

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action dated October 6, 2003. Claims 1 - 9 are pending in this application and have been rejected. There are no amendments in the claims or specification. Reexamination is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 - 9 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGlone '900 in view of Microsoft. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and relies upon Applicant's foreign priority applications to overcome this outstanding rejection.

The '900 application was filed on January 5, 2000. Applicant filed Japanese Patent Application No. 11-365707 on December 22, 1999 and Application No. 11-373997 on December 28, 1999. Both of these dates predate the filing date of McGlone '900.

Applicant submits herewith certified translation of both of the above applications.

In addition, Application submits herewith a copy of the claims from the '997 application which show comparison to claims 1 and 2 of the instant application. The changes or differences between claim 1 of '997 and claims 1 and 2 of this application are shown in writing. The only significant difference between claim 1 of '997 and claim 1 of this application is that this application refers back to the stopping device while discussing the control device.

A similar difference is found by comparing the claims of '707 to those of the instant case.

In '997, and '707, paragraphs [0056] each discuss the use of the stopping device and the control device. These provide full support for the stopping device set forth in the claims of the instant application. Still further, Applicant's specification at page 34, line 6 (the instant application), is the same disclosure as paragraph [0056] in each of the priority documents.

Therefore since the claims match and the supporting disclosure matches, there can be no doubt that Applicant has complete support for the claims in this application in the Japanese priority documents.


Still further, review of the priority documents shows that the specifications in the priority documents is essentially the same as that in the instant application.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the above discussion and proofs show Applicant's priority over the 35 USC § 102(e) filing date attributable to McGlone '900. '900 cannot be considered a reference in this case.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance, and early action in accordance thereof is requested. In the event there is any reason why the application cannot be allowed in this current condition, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact

the undersigned at the number listed below to resolve any problems by Interview or Examiner's Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald R. Snider
Reg. No. 24,962

Date: December 29, 2003

Snider & Associates
Ronald R. Snider
P.O. Box 27613
Washington, D.C. 20038-7613
(202) 347-2600

RRS/bam